

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE

December 11, 2014

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	1
100-F Area ROD, Follow-up to HAB Advice #280	1
Central Plateau Inner Area Cleanup Principles (joint w/ PIC)	5
Committee Business.....	12
Attachments	13
Attendees	14

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and it should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Opening

Pam Larsen, River and Plateau Committee (RAP) chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The committee adopted the November 2014 RAP meeting summary.

100-F Area ROD, Follow-up to HAB Advice #280

Introduction

Dale Engstrom, RAP vice chair, opened the 100-F Area ROD conversation and noted that the committee would be building upon the previous month's discussion on the topic. Dale recognized that many Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) members had expressed frustration that the released ROD did not incorporate any key ideas included within HAB Advice #280. In November 2014, the committee discussed reiterating these key advice points in a letter, and issue managers for the topic had provided committee members with a draft letter for consideration. Dale stated that, as the ROD on 100-F Area was the first final ROD within the River Corridor to be released, the HAB letter to DOE could serve to reinforce the advice points and HAB values as they apply to future decisions.

Regulator Presentation

To provide further background and detail for RAP's conversation, Chris Guizzetti, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), provided a presentation* describing the rationale used by the EPA as the agency considered and ultimately approved the ROD. Chris' presentation noted the following key points:

- Within the 100-F Area, there are 15 waste sites with Institutional Controls (ICs) for contamination at depth, one waste site with an IC for irrigation, and Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA) for groundwater across the 100-F Area.
- For those waste sites with deep ICs, the layer of soil from the surface to 15 feet of depth is the area recognized as the protection zone for human health. If there are any very mobile contaminants discovered, such as hexavalent chromium, it is likely that work will continue to a greater depth. If, however, contamination discovered below 15 feet of depth, it is not considered to be a hazard to human health. Remediation work may continue if contaminants below 15 feet are considered to be hazardous to either groundwater or the environment.
- At the waste site with IC for irrigation, borehole sampling demonstrated hexavalent chromium levels that were slightly above cleanup levels; however, groundwater concentrations were not detectable. Modelling demonstrated that, if there is no irrigation at the site, the hexavalent chromium will never reach cleanup levels in the groundwater. The natural recharge rate is not robust enough. It is very important that the Columbia River be protected to the greatest extent possible, and the irrigation IC at this site is very conservative.
- The timeframes to achieve cleanup levels are based on the maximum concentration ever observed at a monitoring well. This means that many remediation timeframes may be shorter than projected.
- There are eleven additional wells planned for the 100-F Area. If any monitoring wells demonstrate that cleanup levels are being exceeded, the agencies will return to the work plan.

Agency Perspectives

Greg Sinton, U.S. Department of Energy—Richland Operations (DOE-RL), thanked EPA for the presentation. He noted that the fall 2014 groundwater monitoring results were received by DOE, and he stated that there were no surprises in the discovered contaminant levels. Greg recognized that concentrations of hexavalent chromium were demonstrated to be lower than projected.

John Price, Washington Department of Ecology, noted that Washington State, in a similar situation, would not require the same ICs described by EPA.

* **Attachment 1:** 100-F/IU Area ROD (EPA Presentation)

*Committee Questions and Responses***

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. Is the 100-F Area being cleaned up to industrial standards?

R. [EPA] No, the 100-F Area is being remediated to residential standards.

Q. With regards to residential use, irrigation, and agriculture, at what rate would crops uptake contamination?

R. [EPA] The 15 foot depth noted by the Model Toxics Control Act takes agricultural use into account.

Q. Was sampling at 100-F accomplished by aggregating and then averaging soil samples? One of the concerns that has been raised about this method of sampling is that it does not effectively demonstrate whether or not remediation should occur below a 15 foot depth.

R. [DOE-RL] This strategy is known as composite sampling. The results for 100-F Area demonstrate that the site was not sampled using this methodology.

C. The information provided to the committee on the planned addition of monitoring wells in the 100-F Area is very encouraging.

Q. EPA recently revised national standards for acceptable cleanup levels. These new standards would not allow a 12 millirem exposure scenario. It is concerning that these new standards are not being incorporated into the 100-F Area ROD and other Hanford sites. The Board was told in November to expect revisions, but these are not yet apparent. Examples of this re-analysis should be relayed to the Board and to the public.

R. [EPA] The new ROD is based on the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) risk range. The local EPA office works with EPA headquarters whenever cleanup standards change. If RAP or the Board would like a briefing on this specific change, EPA could accommodate that request in the coming months.

C. This is a very technical topic that may not be directly applicable to the proposed 100-F Area ROD letter. RAP will explore the potential for a briefing on this topic sometime within the second quarter of Fiscal Year 2015.

C. EPA provided a very impressive presentation, and I think that it demonstrates that a fair amount of thought and research went into the 100-F Area ROD. A letter from the HAB stating that the TPA agencies did not heed Advice #280 may no longer be necessary.

* **Attachment 2:** Transcribed Flipcharts

* **Attachment 3:** HAB Response to Letter to the 100-F ROD

C. One of the major goals of the 100-F Area Letter was to reiterate some of the HAB's overarching values. There are several big decisions coming up, and this information would be beneficial to reiterate.

C. One long-term value of the HAB is that the River Corridor should be remediated to account for unrestricted use. The agencies should strive for this, as well.

C. One of the 15 waste sites covered by the 100-F Area ROD is noted to have an IC in place for 264 years. Could those alive in 1700s have anticipated modern-day technology and culture? The HAB has noted that ICs that go beyond 100 years are too long. This value needs to be reiterated.

C. The language in the letter needs to recognize that the 100-F Area ROD did not correlate with HAB values. The Columbia River is an attractive nuisance, and fences (ICs) will not deter future generations from recreating along the waterway. There are limited cleanup funds that are available, and enforcing lengthy ICs will cost an incredible amount of money in the long-term.

C. The Board does need to release a letter to reiterate HAB values. This letter could be adapted to future work along the River Corridor. A letter from the HAB would need to recognize HAB principles (MNA is undesirable, groundwater needs to be cleaned up, etc.). The HAB's perspectives on each of the decisions incorporated into the 100-F Area ROD have already been noted in past advice. Therefore, it is important that the Board move forward with this letter with the hope that HAB values are incorporated to a greater extent in future decisions.

C. The idea of a letter as opposed to advice is a good one. This is a conversation that the HAB and the TPA agencies are going to have again as more River Corridor RODs are released. There has to be a better strategy for resolving differences in the future. Currently, when the HAB the agencies disagree, each entity releases a position statement. Enhanced dialogue would be more beneficial to all parties moving forward.

C. A letter would be an excellent opportunity for the HAB to continue to establish Board values. Ideally, the letter would remain policy-level and would not be overburdened with numbers and measurements.

C. It would be appropriate to use the letter as an opportunity to share and reestablish core HAB values. The Board could use the 100-F Area ROD as an example and apply then apply this instance to future River Corridor RODs. The title of the letter should be revised to more appropriately recognize this new direction.

C. Aside from simply recognizing that there are discrepancies between HAB values and the 100-F ROD, this letter provides the HAB with the opportunity to provide common ground information to facilitate future discussions with TPA agencies.

C. The HAB could also look into the values that are included within the Superfund legislation to see if there are any which align with the Board's.

C. The current draft letter does not recognize that groundwater needs to be cleaned up. This needs to be clearly stated.

Dale thanked Chris for his informative presentation and issue managers agreed to continue working on the draft 100-F Area ROD letter and incorporate key ideas presented by committee and agency members. The committee recognized that the letter was an opportunity to reiterate core HAB values and to proactively address future River Corridor RODs. The committee also agreed to look into the possibility of scheduling a briefing with EPA staff in the coming months so that the agency could inform RAP members about the new EPA national cleanup standard and how it will impact the Hanford Site.

Central Plateau Inner Area Cleanup Principles (joint w/ PIC)

Introduction

Dale opened discussion on the Central Plateau Inner Area Cleanup Principles by recognizing the efforts of RAP members on the topic since the Board was initially presented with the Cleanup Principles in November 2014. Dale encouraged RAP members to carefully consider implications of the Cleanup Principles while also keeping in mind clear next steps for RAP and the HAB. Two pieces of draft advice were provided for committee consideration and discussion. Dale noted that Ecology would open the topic by identifying past work that has been conducted on Central Plateau Inner Area Cleanup Principles.

Regulator Perspectives

John Price, Ecology, recognized that the Central Plateau Inner Area Cleanup Principles presented to the HAB in November 2014 were the culmination of approximately twenty years' worth of dialogue and public participation. He provided committee members with a brief presentation* that enumerated examples of this prior work as well as facets of the Cleanup Principles that have recently been updated (see Attachment 3, "Central Plateau Principles Regulatory Perspective," for a detailed list of noted past work, public involvement, and changes).

John closed his presentation by noting that it is difficult to holistically compile the multitude of past work on this broad topic. He recommended that Board members explore a more in-depth review of past work to note overarching themes and more effectively drive future conversations and efforts.

*Committee Questions and Responses******

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

* **Attachment 4:** Central Plateau Principles Regulatory Perspective (Ecology presentation)

* **Attachment 2:** Transcribed Flipcharts

* **Attachment 5:** Topics/Questions for Inclusion in Discussions at a COTW Meeting to Discuss the DOE Central Plateau Principles (handout provided by Shelley Cimon)

* **Attachment 6:** Draft Public Involvement Advice for Central Plateau Cleanup Principles

* **Attachment 7:** Central Plateau Principles Public Involvement Advice: Detailed Background

* **Attachment 8:** Inner Area Principles Advice (Draft v0)

C. Ecology's presentation noted that the National Environmental Policy Act Environmental Impact Statements of 1999 and 2013, and their associated public comment periods, were precursors to the current cleanup principles; however, the current principles demonstrate little evidence that this public feedback was actually taken into account. Future public comment periods for implementing these principles need to be more than just formalities. These principles need dedicated public input and it needs to occur as soon as possible.

C. In order to have a meaningful conversation as to whether or not ICs are a reliable option for remediation, baseline risk assessments need to consider the future risks under the assumption that future generations will utilize resources. This is a conversation that the general public needs to be involved in, and the public needs to weigh in on the acceptability of future risks. Even if the Inner Area were to be cleaned up to an industrial standard, the public still needs to be involved. The provided draft Public Involvement Advice for Central Plateau Cleanup Principles aims to be a simple and straightforward request for enhanced public involvement as these Cleanup Principles are adapted into work plans.

R. [EPA] The ideas that have been raised are appropriate; however, many of the discussions that the committee is referencing will not happen for at least another six to twelve years. At the moment, it is most important that the agencies and the Board simply work to get a feel for these cleanup principles. If, for example, there is a strong sense that scenarios aside from industrial use need to be run, that information should be communicated to agencies sooner rather than later.

Q. EPA has identified that some principles are more timely than others. However, if work plans are currently being written, all of the Central Plateau Cleanup Principles are being used to some extent. Would it not be better to note alternative scenarios and define alternative points of compliance sooner rather than later?

R. [EPA] EPA is curious about both of these identified issues. If the Board, too, is interested in exploring alternative risk scenarios, a letter noting this interest would be beneficial. The sooner the Board could release this to agencies, the better.

C. [DOE-RL] DOE will do a risk assessment; however, we do not have the needed information to conduct this assessment yet. There are many complex sites within the Inner Area (the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF), the burial grounds, etc.). The law requires that these sites will need to be kept up as long as waste remains. A residential scenario takes into account human habitation on a site including all associated activities (such as agriculture), and this scenario would have to take the many waste storage sites into account. The Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies and the HAB would need to carefully consider the utility of information provided by running additional risk assessment scenarios.

Q. Is it possible to run additional risk scenarios on certain areas, such as the tank farms? It would be very informative to have additional analyses done for many Inner Area waste sites.

R. [DOE-RL] Scenarios are very difficult and expensive to run. Again, because of this cost, it is important to consider the information that additional scenarios could functionally provide TPA agencies and the community with.

C. The public needs to know information provided by additional risk assessment scenarios; tribes with treaty rights will have the need to use groundwater. Only after the public has robust risk assessment scenario information can the community continue with an educated discussion.

R. [DOE-RL] There is no specific industrial standard for groundwater—cleanup will still need to meet drinking water standards. DOE will need to conduct pump and treat efforts or whatever else is required to meet these standards; if groundwater a mile away from the site is not in compliance, then the waste site itself is not in compliance.

C. The Hanford Site affects three tribes. In the future, due to the potential of dam removal along the lower Columbia River, fish runs may be much more robust than they currently are. In 100 years, there may be far more fishing, guaranteed by treaty rights affirmed by the Boldt Decision, along the Columbia Reach. Furthermore, treaty rights as they apply to use of upland areas has not yet been adjudicated. This may be why tribes have been arguing for a baseline scenario—so that there is a legal argument to reinforce noted treaty rights. There is a certain loss of these treaty rights even if the CERCLA definitions are used. These arguments—a tribal versus DOE perspective of what “usable” means—will likely occur in the future.

C. The Yakama Nation does not want a large waste management area in the Central Plateau or different points of compliance for soil or groundwater.

Q. Why did the TPA agencies come out with these draft Cleanup Principles and tell the HAB that they are flexible? It seems like documents and work plans are being draft using these principles as a foundation already.

R. [EPA] The vagueness of the current principles is because these are still tentative guiding ideas. The Cleanup Principles themselves are simply one-line statements that will influence future decisions. There are three work plans that are currently being developed for the Inner Area, and they have been at the regulatory agencies for a couple of years already. EPA and Ecology would like to see these work plans approved. To develop work plans, regulatory agencies investigate waste sites and do a baseline risk assessment. This is why regulatory agencies are proposing an industrial risk assessment scenario. These efforts work to develop the proposed plans.

C. These ideas are being called “principles;” however, when presented, they have been framed as decisions for how DOE will move forward with cleanup.

R. [EPA] Whatever cleanup strategies regulators request from DOE need to eventually be paid for. Ultimately, the TPA agencies all want to adopt strategies that are feasible and that each agency is comfortable with. Information-gathering is a very important step that allows the agencies to arrive at sustainable decisions. If, for example, the agencies end up adopting a waste management concept—that is a much greater financial commitment. There is a large difference between managing the entire site as a waste management site versus moving from site to site. We

need to ensure that cleanup decisions are sound, and that they are not being made solely because of financial considerations.

R. [DOE-RL] DOE will also need to consider some form of groundwater protection. It is likely that it will be a very large difference in money; however, the agency needs to ensure the protection of industrial users within that ten square mile zone of the Central Plateau Inner Area. If DOE is not granted that additional point of compliance, the agency is going to spend much more on groundwater cleanup.

Q. Is the word “principle” misleading? Is the HAB approaching these concepts incorrectly because of the presented terminology? Discussions with agencies seem to frame these as questions that will lead TPA agencies to final decisions, not as foundational principles.

R. [DOE-RL] It may not be clear to call these ideas “principles.” TPA agencies will consider the appropriateness of terminology moving forward.

C. One of the most pressing issues with the Inner Area Cleanup Principles is that they do not include an adequate driver for characterization. Leaving waste in place is not management. There are miles of piping buried below ten feet throughout the Inner Area, and there are many leaking junction boxes. No accurate inventory of this waste exists anywhere, and characterization needs to be incorporated to a much greater extent in stated Cleanup Principles to account for this.

C. It is important that the HAB conduct a walk-through of the Inner Area inventory as a precursor to additional discussion.

C. Moving forward with Central Plateau cleanup, it is important that the TPA agencies develop a thorough understanding of what contaminants are present. This will allow cleanup efforts to most appropriately balance risk and cost.

R. [DOE-RL] The proposed characterization would require an incredible amount of effort; teams of workers have been devoting time to this precise activity for seven years and DOE has only scratched the surface of conducting inventory within the Inner Area. The agency is currently working to understand as much as possible about the infrastructure and waste sites so that Central Plateau cleanup can move forward in an appropriate way. Characterization work within the Central Plateau will be very different and much more costly than the characterization work done along the River Corridor.

C. More characterization is needed, but it should go down to 15 feet instead of the proposed ten feet. Available funding and funding shortfalls should not determine cleanup at the Central Plateau or at any other part of the Hanford Site.

R. [EPA] Enhanced characterization will likely occur if a ten-foot point of compliance is adopted, because there is a greater need to know the contaminants that exist at varying soil depths.

C. The Committee of the Whole (COTW) should move forward, and it should look into past practices and incidents as well as explore how the Inner Area Cleanup Principles relate to the timely startup of the

Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant. This COTW should meet before the HAB comes out with advice recommending that the agencies go to the public.

C. There are several areas where the presented principles do not go far enough, for example, burial grounds and trenches. The Board needs to know what DOE means whenever the agency describes a site as a waste management area—that has never been defined. Also, if points of compliance are set on the borders of the Inner Area, how would DOE deal with contamination existing on one side of the line but not the other?

R. [DOE-RL] DOE has discussed internally that the agency will need to have robust monitoring. DOE will have to consider a pump and treat optimization—the idea is to clean up contamination to a point that pump and treat will no longer be necessary.

C. It is troubling that these Cleanup Principles appear to be set. The TPA agencies should have engaged the HAB earlier in the process.

R. [DOE-RL] These principles are not finalized. DOE's presentations have made it clear that many of these principles will need to be studied further and will require regulator approval.

R. [EPA] These principles are not yet incorporated into any work plans and they are not set. DOE is taking all of the HAB's conversations into account as these principles are developed.

Q. What is EPA's buy-in to the proposed Central Plateau Inner Area Cleanup Principles?

R. [EPA] All of these Cleanup Principles meet the National Contingency Plan. It is clear that several of these proposed principles are in conflict with established HAB values, but that is why the Board and the TPA agencies are having this conversation with the Board. EPA has no authority to force additional risk assessment scenarios, but the agency is interested in seeing what information additional risk assessment scenarios would provide. With that being said, the HAB and regulators need to consider what additional scenarios would functionally demonstrate. Will DOE spend cleanup money and resources to run scenarios that will produce information that would not be useful? That is an important conversation that the Board and the TPA agencies need to have.

Q. Did Ecology learn any lessons from looking at the precursors to the current Cleanup Principles?

R. [Ecology] There was past discussion relating to the inclusion of a tribal scenario.

Q. How should the RAP committee and the HAB proceed with this topic?

R. The public involvement advice is very succinct with a very strong, detailed background, and the draft advice itself presents many important ideas. The TPA agencies have demonstrated today that there is a push to finalize these principles, but that they will likely not be functionally implemented for many years. This timeframe provides ample opportunity for public comment and outreach.

R. Some of the Central Plateau Inner Area Cleanup Principles are principles, but others are assumptions that DOE is making. The agencies may need to conduct additional work on teasing out some of the nuances in the presented concepts. RAP discussion has demonstrated that there is more work that needs to be done beyond simply presenting these principles to the public.

Q. The public involvement advice was originally conceptualized as encouraging DOE to gather feedback from the public on the proposed Central Plateau Inner Area Cleanup Principles through regional meetings, etc. However, the committee conversation has moved in a different direction. Is this still the public involvement goal?

R. The ideas have remained the same. At past meetings, RAP members have noted that a public understanding of the risks that Central Plateau cleanup presents is key to moving forward mindfully with cleanup efforts. There needs to be public involvement as characterization occurs—not as work plans are finalized and work begins on at individual waste sites. An early opportunity for public involvement is vital.

Q. Are issue managers for the Central Plateau Inner Area Cleanup Principles public involvement advice advocating that the Board move forward with this advice? Would the Board develop a draft public involvement plan for DOE?

R. That is a question for the Board, RAP, and the potential COTW. EPA has noted that there are several decisions that need to be made sooner rather than later; however, it may be confusing to bring the principles to the public piecemeal.

R. Any Board products relating to Central Plateau Inner Area Cleanup Principles should keep the HAB response to the principals separate from any public involvement plan.

Q. [EPA] The TPA agencies worked to get these Cleanup Principles to the Board as soon as possible. This has likely led to the concepts not being packaged as effectively as they could have been. The idea of public involvement at this stage is a very large discussion, and much work would need to happen before that could be feasible. If the TPA agencies are not in disagreement on any of these principles, what information would go out for public comment?

R. Even if the TPA agencies were in perfect agreement on these principles, it would be in the best interest of the entire Hanford community to present these principles to the public for purposes of enhanced buy-in. It would be beneficial to have this conversation with the public, and it would be helpful for the Board to weigh-in on framing this public involvement plan.

C. [Ecology] There have been many articulate comments made today. It seems like the committee is well on its way to developing advice on these Cleanup Principles.

C. This topic is important to the entire HAB, and a COTW is appropriate. Conversations developed in the COTW could help to better inform and guide conversations regarding public involvement. Convening a COTW sooner rather than later would be ideal—previous conversations have identified the day prior to the February Board meetings as a candidate meeting day.

Q. Do the TPA agencies see any value in convening a COTW?

R. [DOE-RL] There is value in getting feedback from the HAB on these Cleanup Principles. DOE has milestones for certain parts of the agency's work plan, and the agency needs to continue to make progress towards meeting these milestones. If the Board would like to see a detailed public involvement plan revolving around the Cleanup Principles, this will need to be formally communicated to the agencies, because it is a departure from past protocol. Public involvement does not usually enter into the process until the proposed plan phase, which is currently at least a decade away.

R. [EPA] The agencies will meet in February to discuss these principles. However, work plans will not be finalized within the next six months.

Q. EPA mentioned that the agencies are meeting in February to discuss these principles further. Will agency staff meet to approve these principles?

R. [EPA] The February conversation is planned to be a management discussion. The HAB was incorporated in this conversation at a very early stage, and the agencies are still involved in technical discussions.

C. [DOE-RL] DOE would like advice on these principles sooner rather than later, and the agency would request that the advice provide information and identify the next steps that the Board would like the agency to take. If there is a compelling argument for running additional scenarios, etc. DOE will consider these actions.

C. The TPA agencies obviously worked to involve the HAB in this conversation early. If the Board were to consider advice on this topic at the upcoming February meeting, it is likely that HAB members would have many of the same conversations the that RAP committee has had over the past two months. For this reason, a COTW is very important. It will allow HAB members to engage with this topic before a Board meeting.

C. There appears to be a short-term and a long-term path forward. In the short-term, the agencies would like the HAB to provide feedback on the long-term Cleanup Principles. This is an opportunity for the HAB to contribute at the ground level, and the Board needs to recognize that there will likely be dead-ends along the way. However, the HAB's early entry may provide the Board with the opportunity to request enhanced characterization in the Central Plateau.

Q. When would be the most appropriate time for the HAB to release advice?

R. [EPA] For the more pressing principles, April 2015 is timely for advice. June 2015 will be too late.

Dale thanked the agencies and the committee for a productive discussion. He noted that issue managers would explore calls to craft framing questions and continue to discuss and develop the topic in January. Dale noted that the two issue manager groups for Central Plateau Inner Area Principles would work

together moving forward, and that future HAB calls would continue to explore the potential for holding a COTW meeting prior to the February Board Meeting.

Committee Business

*RAP 3-Month Work Plan**

The committee updated its 3-Month Work Plan and will not request a committee meeting in January 2015. Instead, issue managers for the 100-F Area and Central Plateau Inner Area Cleanup Principles topics will utilize calls to further discuss and develop committee products. RAP will plan to meet in February and explore the following topics:

- Further discussion and advice development on Central Plateau Inner Area Principles following issue manager discussions (COTW tentatively scheduled for the day preceding the February 2015 Board Meeting).
- Discussion on the public involvement letter for Central Plateau Inner Area Principles.
- An update on 242-Z Waste Treatment Facility.
- An update on the Hanford Site Deferred Maintenance Plan.

For March 2015, RAP tentatively identified 618-10 Vertical Pipe Units, the ERDF Proposed Plan, the 100 D/H Proposed Plan, and the next RL Vision as a potential topics for discussion.

* **Attachment 2:** Transcribed Flipcharts

Attachments

Attachment 1: 100-F/IU Area ROD (EPA Presentation)

Attachment 2: Transcribed Flipcharts

Attachment 3: HAB Response to Letter to the 100-F ROD

Attachment 4: Central Plateau Principles Regulatory Perspective (Ecology presentation)

Attachment 5: Topics/Questions for Inclusion in Discussions at a COTW Meeting to Discuss the DOE
Central Plateau Principles (handout provided by Shelley Cimon)

Attachment 6: Draft Public Involvement Advice for Central Plateau Cleanup Principles

Attachment 7: Central Plateau Principles Public Involvement Advice: Detailed Background

Attachment 8: Inner Area Principles Advice (Draft v0)

Attendees

Board members and alternates:

Jan Catrell	Steve Hudson	Ed Revell
Shelley Cimon	Pam Larsen	Dan Serres
Dale Engstrom	Susan Leckband	Bob Suyama
Gary Garnant	Liz Mattson	Art Tackett
Becky Holland	Jonathan Matthews	Jean Vanni
John Howieson (phone)	Gerry Pollet	

Others:

Greg Sinton, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Bruce Ford, CHPRC
Kris Skopeck, DOE-RL	Chris Guzzetti, EPA	Alex Nazarali, CTUIR
Alex Teimouri, DOE-RL	Emy Laija, EPA	Ryan Orth, EnviroIssues
	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Brett Watson, EnviroIssues
	Elis Eberlein, Ecology	Morgan Ashley, KNDU
	John Price, Ecology	Mark McKenna, MSA
	Deborah Singleton, Ecology	Rick Moren, MSA
	Tom Rodgers, WDOH	Sharon Braswell, Northwind/DOE-ORP (phone)
		Pedro de la Torre III, RPI
		Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald